



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,085	07/21/2003	Mark Kelley	03-40118-US	6000
7590 REDD SMITH LLP Thomas J. McWilliams 2500 One Liberty Place 1650 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-7301		01/03/2007	EXAMINER [REDACTED]	LU, CHARLES EDWARD
			ART UNIT [REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER 2161
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/624,085	KELLEY ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Charles E. Lu	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-105 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-105 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 10/1/2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____.

Response to Amendment/Response to Arguments

1. Replacement drawings for figs 1, 3, 4, and 5 are noted. Objection to figs. 1, 3, 4, 5 are withdrawn. Objection to fig. 2 is maintained because the component described by reference numeral 226 should be labeled appropriately (e.g., "Heuristic Modeler").
2. Amendment to the title is noted. The objection to the title is maintained because the title is not sufficiently descriptive of the claimed subject matter. The following title is suggested:

**SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING TARGETED CONTENT TO A USER
BASED ON USER CHARACTERISTICS**

3. Objection to the specification is maintained because the specification does not mention fig. 5 is the "brief description of the drawings" section.
4. Amendments to the claims to address the claim objections are noted. Objection to the claims is withdrawn.
5. Arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections have been fully considered. The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C 101 is withdrawn.
6. Amendments to the claims for addressing the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection are noted. Rejection of claims 14 and 49-51, are withdrawn. Rejection of claims 91-102 are maintained. Applicant argues that "the communications devices" and "at least one user of a communications device" are not referring to the same thing. However, the examiner recognizes that on line 4 of claim 91, the claim

recites “the communications devices” without previously reciting communications devices. Therefore, “the communications devices” on line 4 lack antecedent basis.

7. Arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues for independent claims 53, 59, 81, and 91 that “the searcher of Kramer does not communicate with any device whatsoever” (Amendment, p. 31, 4th line from bottom). The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The searcher of Kramer must communicate with a device, such as the client computer (fig. 1, #102, col. 21, l. 60) in order to provide the illumination (content) to the user. For example, in fig. 8, cited in the previous action, the searcher is shown filtering unsorted illuminations (#808-812), involving selecting a set of illuminations that match the facts about the consumer (which must involve searching for the best matches, col. 21, ll. 50-60), and finally displaying them (#820).

Applicant further argues that Applicant’s invention does not have a merchant designation (Amendment, p. 32, l. 8). However, the examiner recognizes that “not having a merchant designation” is not recited in the claims.

Applicant further argues that providing of illumination lists and scores is not providing content (amendment, p. 31, last 8 lines). The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The searcher provides a list of illuminations to the user (see above). An illumination comprises content (Kramer, col. 21, ll. 34-36, col. 4, ll. 64-66). Therefore, providing illumination lists is providing content.

Applicant further argues that the searcher does not operate to provide content over the network in accordance with the database. The examiner disagrees.

Kramer states, "the computing device 802 has access to a database 804...resident outside of the device, such as on a remote server computer maintained at a web site" (col. 20, ll. 64-66). Therefore, the content must be provided over the network, because the database (and searcher) is located on a remote server. Note again fig. 8.

The above discussion therefore applies to similar independent claims 59, 81, and 91, and the dependent claims stand rejected.

The arguments on pp. 34-35 of the Amendment contain similar points and are treated in the discussion above.

The prior art rejections are maintained.

Drawings

8. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to fig. 2, reference numeral 226 should be labeled appropriately (e.g., "Heuristic Modeler").

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure

is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

9. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:

The objection to the title is maintained because the title is not sufficiently descriptive of the claimed subject matter. The following title is suggested:

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING TARGETED CONTENT TO A USER
BASED ON USER CHARACTERISTICS

Objection to the specification is maintained because the specification does not mention fig. 5 in the "brief description of the drawings" section.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 91-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Rejection of claims 91-102 are maintained. Applicant argues that "the communications devices" and "at least one user of a communications device" are not referring to the same thing. However, the examiner recognizes that on line 4 of claim 91, the claim recites "the communications devices" without previously reciting communications devices. Therefore, "the communications devices" on line 4 lack antecedent basis.

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the above terms in light of the specification has been given to the claims. Art rejection of the above claims is applied as best understood in light of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 53, 56-57, 59, 61-65, 69-70, 72-79, 81, 83-93, and 96-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e) as being anticipated by Kramer et al (U.S. Patent 6,327,574).

As to independent claim 53, Kramer teaches the following claimed subject matter:

A communications device (computing device, col. 20, l. 57) operated by the user;

A virtual database¹ (e.g., contents of box 802 in fig. 8 including the database) comprising at least one characteristic about said user (facts, col. 20, ll. 65-66, fig. 8, interpretation of user characteristic documents 806 and stored into database 804);

A searcher (see “illumination selection process” starting at col. 23, l. 5 with selection engine, col. 17, ll. 40-50) having access to a plurality of targeted messages and to said virtual database, wherein said searcher filters (finds best match, ranks, etc) at least one of the targeted messages that is of interest to the user according to at least one of the at least one characteristics (see section on “illumination selection Process”, col. 23, l. 5); and

Wherein said searcher communicates the at least one targeted message of interest to said communications device for provision to the user (fig. 8, #818, 820).

As to claim 56, Kramer of claim 53 further teaches wherein the virtual database comprises an overall model including the user characteristic, wherein the user characteristic is heuristically predicted (col. 21-33).

As to claim 57, Kramer of claim 56 further teaches wherein the targeted message comprises a vendor advertisement (e.g., see illuminations on fig. 3B) and wherein the at least one characteristic comprises at least one heuristically predicted characteristic and at least one actual characteristic (see fig. 8, col. 21-32), and wherein the interest assessed according to the at least one characteristic (appeal, col. 11, ll. 10-37, col. 20, ll. 27-54, interest, col. 15, ll. 24-32) comprises an interest in purchasing from the at least one vendor advertisement (illumination). Positive responses to an advertisement (such as clicking on the advertisement) is considered to be an interest in purchasing the product from the corresponding vendor.

As to independent claim 59, Kramer teaches the following claimed subject matter:

Building a virtual database of information regarding the user (e.g., contents of box 802 in fig. 8 including the database, facts, col. 20, ll. 65-66, fig. 8, interpretation of user characteristic documents 806 and stored into database 804);

Modeling at least one probabilistic behavior of the user, in accordance with the virtual database (see for example the section on consumer models and probabilities, col. 24, l. 36 and also the section on col. 22, l. 16, and also see "mapping and sorting," fig. 8, #810, attribute vector, cols. 21-32);

Searching for content targeted to the at least one modeled probabilistic behavior; and providing the content to the communications device (see "illumination selection

¹ The Term "Virtual Database" as understood from the specification means a database, a relational database, a database server, a server farm, or the like (para. 5).

process" starting at col. 23, l. 5, and the selection engine, col. 17, ll. 40-50, fig. 8, #818, 820).

As to claim 61, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches wherein the means for accepting a virtual database comprises means for monitoring a plurality of information input by the user (col. 5, ll. 28-45).

As to claim 62, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches wherein the building comprises monitoring transactions engaged in by the user (e.g., col. 3, ll. 10-20, col. 5, l. 27 "illumination and interpretation", col. 10, l. 25 "Profiles").

As to claim 63, Kramer of claim 62 further teaches wherein the means for monitoring comprises monitoring positive responses by the user to the provided content (see content rotator, which is activated when the user has a positive response, i.e., the user is interested in more advertisements from a merchant, col. 31, ll. 1-67).

As to claim 64, Kramer of claim 62 further teaches updating the virtual database in accordance with the monitoring (see "updating the consumer model," starting from col. 24, l. 36).

As to claim 65, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches wherein the building comprises monitoring a time and location of the user (col. 6, ll. 8-21).

As to claim 69, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches restricting access to the virtual database (col. 16, ll. 31-47).

As to claim 70, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches wherein the modeling comprises comparing the virtual database with general behavioral information (e.g., see pregnancy, col. 21, ll. 20-31).

As to claim 72, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches comprising accepting a heuristic search request in accordance with said modeling, wherein said searching is further in accordance with the heuristic search request (e.g., col. 15, ll. 20-63, col. 18, l. 50 – col. 19, l. 18, col. 23, ll. 15-54, described fully in col. 21-33 and the relevant sections on illumination selection).

As to claim 73, Kramer of claim 72 further teaches limiting the providing of content to those having a minimum modeled probability (col. 23, ll. 15-22, col. 22, ll. 55-67).

As to claim 74, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches wherein the modeling comprises weighting actual data in the virtual database, monitored data in the virtual database, and heuristic data in the virtual database (e.g., col. 22, ll. 15-40, col. 21-32 elaborates).

As to claim 75, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches targeting the content in accordance with a vendor instruction (see selection policies, col. 15, ll. 45-62). Note that the vendor instruction has to be received in order to perform any processing on it.

As to claim 76, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches prioritizing the content in accordance with the modeling (e.g., sorting, ranking, col. 21, ll. 32-60, col. 23, ll. 54-63).

As to claims 77 and 78, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches wherein the providing comprises tailoring the content to the user's communications device in accordance with the virtual database (the illuminations are targeted, or customized, based on the user's characteristics, col. 21, ll. 32-60).

As to claim 79, Kramer of claim 59 further teaches wherein the modeling accesses transactional habit (e.g., col. 8, ll. 41-55) and personal preference data (see section on hierarchical models, col. 20, l. 54, and col. 12, ll. 17-26, col. 10, ll. 50-67, col. 6, ll. 8-21).

As to independent claim 81, Kramer teaches the following claimed subject matter:

Means for accepting a virtual database of information regarding the user (e.g., contents of box 802 in fig. 8 including the database, facts, col. 20, ll. 65-66, fig. 8, interpretation of user characteristic documents 806 and stored into database 804);

Means for modeling at least one probabilistic behavior of the user, in accordance with the virtual database (see for example the section on consumer models, col. 24, l. 36 and also the section on col. 22, l. 16, and also see “mapping and sorting,” fig. 8, #810, and the attribute vector, cols. 21-32);

Means for searching for content targeted to the at least one modeled probabilistic behavior (see “illumination selection process” starting at col. 23, l. 5, and the selection engine, col. 17, ll. 40-50); and

Means for providing the content to the communications device (fig. 8, #818, 820).

As to claim 83, Kramer of claim 81 further teaches wherein the means for accepting a virtual database comprises means for monitoring a plurality of information input by the user (col. 5, ll. 28-45).

As to claim 84, Kramer of claim 81 further teaches wherein the accepting means comprises monitoring transactions engaged in by the user (col. 3, ll. 10-20, col. 5, l. 27 “illumination and interpretation”, col. 10, l. 25 “Profiles”).

As to claim 85, Kramer of claim 84 further teaches wherein the means for monitoring comprises monitoring positive responses by the user to the provided content (see content rotator, which is activated when the user has a positive response, i.e., the user is interested in more advertisements from a merchant, col. 31, ll. 1-67).

As to claim 86, Kramer of claim 81 further teaches wherein the accepting means comprises means for monitoring a time and location of the user (col. 6, ll. 8-21).

As to claim 87, Kramer of claim 81 further teaches a real time cache for the information (see col. 16, ll. 48-59). The client database cache is real time because it is actively running, as seen throughout Kramer.

As to claim 88, Kramer of claim 81 further teaches wherein the modeling means comprises a database including general behavioral information (col. 6, ll. 18-21, and pertinent sections on the database storing facts).

As to claim 89, Kramer of claim 81 further teaches means for targeting the content in accordance with a vendor instruction (see selection policies, col. 15, ll. 45-62).

As to claim 90, Kramer of claim 81 further teaches prioritizing means for prioritizing the content in accordance with the modeling means (col. 21, ll. 32-62, col. 23, ll. 54-63).

As to independent claim 91, Kramer teaches the following claimed subject matter:

At least one network interface to at least one network (fig. 6, see various interfaces connected to the network, e.g., #1-6);

A plurality of device interfaces to the communications device (see fig. 6 interfaces to the client, in addition to a separable database, col. 16, ll. 44-49, col. 20, ll. 62-66, which adds at least a second interface to the communications device);

A searching interface (fig. 6, at least the interface to the page illuminator N, also see fig. 8);

A storage database (fig. 6, at least the database J) comprising at least one actual user characteristic of the at least one user (at least the facts, col. 20, ll. 65-66, fig. 8, interpretation of user characteristic documents 806 and stored into database 804) and the at least one heuristic user characteristic of the at least one user (at least the attribute vector mapping and sorting use data from the facts in the database, fig. 8, col. 21, ll. 1-6); and

A controller (at least a processor controlling the page illuminator and selection engine, fig. 6, col. 17, ll. 40-50) communicatively connected to the at least one network interface (the communication with the network is seen in col. 12, ll. 1-6), the plurality of device interfaces (the selection engine has to communicate with the client interfaces of fig. 6 as discussed above to send and receive information), the searching interface (as discussed above), and the storage database (also as discussed above);

Wherein said controller generates the at least one heuristic user characteristic (estimate) in accordance with the at least one actual user characteristic, and wherein said controller generates a search (selecting an appropriate content for presentation) for the searching interface in accordance with at least one of the at least one heuristic² user characteristic (see attribute vector, cols. 21-32 involving a measure of confidence, i.e. likelihood, that a user possesses a certain characteristic), the at least one actual user characteristic (attribute vector mapping and sorting uses data from the facts in the database, fig. 8, col. 21, ll. 1-6), a monitoring of the at least one network interface, and a monitoring of at least one of the plurality of device interfaces (e.g., monitoring of user's behaviors and documents on the internet, shown in fig. 7, and the server side and client side examples on col. 12-33, a summary found on cols. 2-3).

As to claim 92, Kramer of claim 91 further teaches wherein the controller (processor) controls information passing to the storage database, as shown by the data movement in fig. 8 and the related text, from the network interface (see Internet connected to the database in fig. 6).

As to claim 93, Kramer of claim 92 further teaches wherein the controller comprises a comparator (see for example pregnancy, col. 21, ll. 21-31).

As to claim 96, Kramer of claim 91 further teaches wherein the heuristic user characteristic comprises a search request (query) from the controller (processor) to be performed by the searching interface (to find the most appropriate targeted content, col. 22, ll. 55-67).

² The Term "Heuristic" as understood from the specification means a value based on an estimation or

As to claim 97, Kramer of claim 91 further teaches wherein said controller instructs said searching interface in accordance with a statistical probability output of the at least one heuristic user characteristic, in accordance with a comparison to the at least one actual user characteristic (col. 21, ll. 7-61, col. 18, l. 49 – col. 19, l. 18, col. 21-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-2, 5-17, 22-25, 27-28, 30-34, 41-52, 66-68, 71, 80, 95, and 98-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al (U.S. Patent 6,327,574).

As to independent claim 1, Kramer teaches the following claimed subject matter:

A communications device (a least the computing device, col. 20, l. 57) in communication with a network (at least the Internet, fig. 6);

A virtual database accessible to the communications device (at least col. 20, ll. 62-65, and see fig. 6) over the network (at least the contents of box 802 in fig. 8 including the database), wherein the virtual database comprises: at least one actual

prediction.

user characteristic accepted over the network (at least the facts, col. 20, ll. 65-66, fig. 8, interpretation of user characteristic documents 806 and stored into database 804); and a heuristic modeler (at least the mapping and sorting, fig. 8, #810, #816) that generates at least one heuristic user characteristic (at least the attribute vector, cols. 21-32) in accordance with the at least one actual user characteristic (at least the attribute vector mapping uses data from the facts in the database, fig. 8, col. 21, ll. 1-6); and

A searcher that provides content to the communications device in accordance with the virtual database (see "illumination selection process" using illumination sorting starting at col. 23, l. 5).

Kramer further discloses that the client service includes a database (fig. 6, item M, col. 16, ll. 44-48, col. 20, ll. 62-66) and searcher (includes selection engine, col. 17, ll. 40-50) located inside Page Illuminator (N). Therefore, the searcher communicates with the communications device.

Kramer does not expressly teach communicating over the network.

The selection engine of Kramer can also be separated from the client, because it has been held that making separable is obvious. *In re Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer such that the searcher is located separately from the client service, both accessible through the network (Internet, see fig. 6). The motivation would have been to reduce the processing load of the client (fig. 6, #600).

As to claim 2, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches wherein the network comprises an internet (see fig. 6).

As to claim 5, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches wherein the communications device is a computer (see fig. 1).

As to claim 6, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches at least one monitor, wherein said at least one monitor monitors at least one of said at least one communications device (e.g., user transactions), wherein said monitor is communicatively connected to said virtual database (see client and server side components starting from col. 12, l. 1), and wherein at least one actual user characteristic is varied in accordance with at least one output of said at least one monitor (see “updating a consumer model”, col. 24, l. 36).

As to claim 7, Kramer of claim 6 further teaches wherein the monitor comprises a time and location monitor (time and location information of the user is monitored via structured documents, col. 6, ll. 8-21).

As to claim 8, Kramer of claim 6 further teaches wherein the monitor provides an actual characteristic comprising time of activity information (col. 6, ll. 8-21).

As to claim 9, Kramer of claim 6 does not expressly disclose wherein two user characteristics are batched prior to acceptance over the network by the database.

However, official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to batch several files (e.g., using a file utility such as “zipping” to batch and compress several files together).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the information in the database is batched. The motivation would have been to save space, as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Kramer does not expressly disclose accepting the information after the batching (interpreted as accepting database and model information about customer transactions, behaviors, etc).

However, official notice is again taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to accept information after batching (for example, from the Internet, one would download and accept an already "zipped" file).

Therefore, it would also have been obvious to further modify Kramer such that after the batching the system will accept the data into the database. The motivation would have been to save bandwidth on the network and increase file transfer speed.

As to claim 10, Kramer of claim 6 further teaches wherein the monitor records activity on a network (col. 5, ll. 30-45).

As to claim 11, Kramer of claim 6 further teaches wherein the monitor comprises a database (see fig. 6).

As to claim 12, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches wherein the user characteristic is accepted from the user (col. 5, ll. 51-55).

As to claim 13, Kramer of claim 12, does not expressly teach wherein two actual user characteristics comprise one user profile accepted into the database from the user over the network.

However, Kramer teaches that the database operates on several sources of consumer data, including forms filled in by the viewer (col. 5, ll. 39-40).

Official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional for a user to fill out a user profile using an online form, such as a web form. The form can have several fields corresponding to actual user characteristics, such as name, address, and hobbies/interests.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that two actual user characteristics comprise one user profile accepted into the database from the user over the network. The motivation would have been to further increase the interpretation ability (col. 5, ll. 30-45) of Kramer, to produce a more detailed consumer profile (e.g., col. 5, ll. 62-63).

As to claim 14, Kramer of claim 12 further teaches an access restrictor restricting access to the user characteristic (col. 16, ll. 31-47).

As to claim 15, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches wherein the database is two way accessible to the communications device over the network (i.e., one can read and write to the database, col. 20, ll. 57-67).

As to claim 16, the virtual database of Kramer of claim 1 has to have a processor (for processing data), a database, a memory, and a comparator (e.g., for Boolean Abstractor). See fig. 8 and related text.

As to claim 17, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches a real time cache (see col. 16, II. 48-59). The cache is real time because it is actively running, as seen throughout Kramer.

Kramer does not expressly teach wherein the user characteristic is real time cached in the real-time cache.

However, official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to cache data in a real time cache.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the user characteristic is cached in the real time cache. The motivation would have been to increase performance, as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 22, Kramer of claim 1 teaches wherein the heuristic modeler comprises at least two interrelated databases (e.g., DB, attribute vector, etc, see fig. 10).

Kramer does not expressly teach wherein the interrelated databases are relational databases.

However, official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to use a relational database.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the databases are relational databases. The motivation would have been to adapt to mainstream database design.

As to claim 23, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches the following claimed subject matter:

At least one network interface to at least one network (fig. 6, see various interfaces connected to the network, e.g., #1-6);

A plurality of device interfaces to the communications device (see fig. 6 interfaces to the client, in addition to a separable database, col. 16, ll. 44-49, col. 20, ll. 62-66, which adds at least a second interface to the communications device);

A searcher interface (fig. 6, interface to the page illuminator N, also see fig. 8);

A storage database (fig. 6, database J, fig. 8, #804) comprising at least one actual user characteristic of the at least one user (facts, col. 20, ll. 65-66, fig. 8, interpretation of user characteristic documents 806 and stored into database 804) and the at least one heuristic user characteristic of the at least one user (attribute vector mapping and sorting use data from the facts in the database, fig. 8, col. 21, ll. 1-6); and

A controller (page illuminator and selection engine, fig. 6, col. 17, ll. 40-50) communicatively connected to the at least one network interface (the communication with the network is seen in col. 12, ll. 1-6), the plurality of device interfaces (the selection engine has to communicate with the client interfaces of fig. 6 as discussed above to send and receive information), the searching interface (as discussed above), and the storage database (also as discussed above);

As to claim 24, Kramer of claim 23 further teaches wherein the controller (processor) controls information passing to the storage database, as shown by the data movement in fig. 8 and the related text.

As to claim 25, Kramer of claim 24 further teaches wherein the controller comprises at least a comparator (col. 12, ll. 20-60).

As to claim 27, Kramer of claim 1 does not expressly disclose wherein the actual user characteristic comprises a search request from the user to be performed by the searcher.

However, Kramer discloses an actual user characteristic, and a searcher (see for example the illumination selection process of Kramer). Kramer discusses that it was conventional in “banner” advertising to accept a search request from a user (col. 1, l. 62 – col. 2, l. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the actual user characteristic comprises a search request and the searcher uses the characteristic for providing a targeted advertisement. The motivation would have been to provide “banner” advertising based on a user search request with a higher probability to be of interest to the user (based on col. 2, ll. 3-15), because Kramer builds an accurate consumer model, as taught throughout Kramer. Thus, the advertising power of Kramer is increased.

As to claim 28, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches wherein the virtual database weighs the actual characteristic and the heuristic characteristic (col. 24, ll. 25-30, col. 23, ll. 31-35).

As to claim 30, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches wherein the heuristic modeler comprises a plurality of predictive rules in accordance with general behavioral patterns

of persons other than the user (see col. 10, ll. 58-61, and the process for generating and updating the consumer model, found throughout Kramer).

As to claim 31, Kramer of claim 30 teaches wherein the patterns are entered into the modeler (at least indirectly). The information has to be entered into the modeler to be processed by the modeler.

Kramer does not expressly disclose directly entering.

However, official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to directly enter data into a modeler for convenience, rather than, for example, having the modeler search for the data to be entered.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the data is directly entered into the modeler. The motivation would have been to facilitate processing, as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 32, Kramer of claim 30 further teaches wherein the general behavioral patterns are monitored by the heuristic modeler. The monitoring of the behavioral patterns have to take place to achieve "characterizing behavior in terms of the degree to which the behavior correlates with the archetypes of mom, businessman, etc", col. 10, ll. 55-65.

As to claim 33, Kramer of claim 30 further teaches wherein said virtual database instructs said searcher in accordance with a statistical probability output of the heuristic modeler, in accordance with a comparison of the at least one actual user characteristic and the predictive rules (col. 21, ll. 1-67, fully described through col. 33).

As to claim 34, Kramer of claim 33 teaches a user behavior responsive to the content provided to the user by the searcher (e.g., col. 32, l. 45 – col. 33, l. 14).

Kramer does not expressly disclose updating the statistical probability analysis (i.e. consumer modeling) with the user behavior.

However, because Kramer teaches that the consumer models reflect the characteristics of the consumer (section starting at col. 10, l. 46), and that the consumer model is continuously refined (col. 11, ll. 38-54), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the user behavior provides feedback to update the consumer database. The motivation would have been to further refine the consumer profile to gain an accurate consumer model, as taught throughout Kramer (e.g., col. 11, ll. 38-54), since useful information about the consumer's interest (e.g., consumer is interested in children's books, col. 32, ll. 66-67) is known.

As to claim 41, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches a vendor data access in communication with the virtual database (see fig. 6, the vendor data access, which at least includes the illumination server storing illuminations for access, is communicating with at least the database in client service).

As to claim 42, Kramer of claim 41 further teaches wherein the vendor data access comprises a plurality of messages (illuminations) entered by a plurality of vendors (note that the vendors are billed according to the use of illuminations in the illumination server, col. 17, ll. 61-67, thus, the illuminations are at least indirectly entered

into the server by the vendor of at least the illuminations, see also fig. 3B for an example of a plurality of vendors participating in the advertising of Kramer).

As to claim 43, Kramer of claim 42 further teaches wherein the vendor data access is in communication with the searcher (see fig. 6, and fig. 8).

As to claim 44, Kramer of claim 43 further teaches wherein the vendor data access comprises a hyperlink (col. 18, ll. 38-42).

As to claim 45, Kramer of claim 43 further teaches wherein the content comprises at least two of the plurality of messages (see fig. 3B for an example of several pieces of content), wherein at least two messages are prioritized (see fig. 15, and col. 31, ll. 32-38).

As to claim 46, Kramer of claim 45 teaches prioritizing a plurality of messages corresponding to a plurality of vendors (see displaying illumination content, col. 21-32 and related figures 14-16) and fees for the messages or advertisements (billing, col. 17, ll. 62-67).

Kramer does not expressly disclose a fee paid by at least two of the vendors and prioritizing in accordance with the fee.

However, Kramer suggests that the illuminations are prioritized according to the paid fees. In other words, if the fees are not paid, the advertisements are not shown, and thus the messages are not prioritized for presentation to the user. Hence, the messages can be prioritized only when the fees are paid (i.e., in accordance with paid fees).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the messages are displayed and prioritized if the fees are paid. The motivation as known to one of ordinary skill in the art would have been to benefit the advertising system's profits; it would be undesirable for the advertising system to provide advertising services to vendors free of charge.

As to claim 47, Kramer of claim 45 further teaches wherein the messages are prioritized according to a probability of success according to the heuristic user characteristic (col. 31, ll. 32-38).

As to claim 48, Kramer of claim 43 further teaches wherein said vendor data access further comprises at least one of the at least one actual user characteristic and the at least one heuristic user characteristic (see fig. 8 and associated explanations), and wherein said searcher selects the content in accordance with the at least one of the at least one actual user characteristic and the at least one heuristic user characteristic in said vendor data access (see the process of selecting an appropriate illumination in Kramer).

As to claim 49, Kramer of claim 48 further teaches wherein said searcher comprises a filter that identifies the content as relevant to the virtual database (see sections on illumination selection, e.g., col. 21, ll. 20-60, col. 23-24, 30-33, col. 18, l. 50 – col. 19, l. 20).

As to claim 50, Kramer of claim 49 further teaches tailoring the content to the user in according to the virtual database because the content (illuminations) are chosen

according to how well they correspond to the consumer's profile model, stored in the database (col. 21, ll. 1-60, full description found in col. 22-33).

As to claim 51, Kramer of claim 49 further teaches wherein the filter comprises an internet interface (see fig. 6, connection between the illumination server, client, and the Internet), and wherein the internet interface accesses internet information responsive to said virtual database (this has to happen in order for the consumer to receive the custom selected illuminations from the server), and wherein the content (illuminations, advertisements, etc) comprises the accessed internet information (as discussed above).

As to claim 52, Kramer of claim 1 further teaches monitoring a user response (e.g., for the content rotator, the feedback such as clicking the rotator showing that the user is interested) responsive to content provided to the user (illuminations selected for the user, e.g., col. 32, l. 45 – col. 33, l. 14).

Kramer does not expressly disclose updating the virtual database (for modeling) according to the response.

However, because Kramer teaches that the consumer models reflect the characteristics of the consumer (section starting at col. 10, l. 46), and that the consumer model is continuously refined (col. 11, ll. 38-54), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the response updates virtual database of the consumer model. The motivation would have been to further refine the consumer profile to gain an accurate consumer model, as taught throughout Kramer (e.g., col. 11, ll. 38-54),

since useful information about the consumer's interest (e.g., consumer is interested in children's books, col. 32, ll. 66-67) is known.

As to claim 66, Kramer of claim 59 does not expressly disclose wherein building comprises batching the information.

However, official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to batch several files (e.g., using a file utility such as "zipping" to batch and compress several files together).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the information in the database is batched. The motivation would have been to save space, as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Kramer does not expressly disclose accepting the information after the batching (interpreted as accepting database and model information about customer transactions, behaviors, etc).

However, official notice is again taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to accept information after batching (for example, from the Internet, one would download and accept an already "zipped" file).

Therefore, it would also have been obvious to further modify Kramer such that after the batching the system will accept the data into the database. The motivation would have been to save bandwidth on the network and increase file transfer speed.

As to claim 67, Kramer of claim 59 does not expressly disclose a particular order of caching the information prior to the modeling.

However, Kramer discloses caching and modeling (col. 16, ll. 32-47, col. 16, ll. 48-60, section on models starting in col. 20, l. 53).

It has been held that changes in sequence of adding ingredients are obvious. *Ex parte Rubin*, 128 USPQ 440 (Bd. App. 1959). In this case, the ingredients added in the system comprise the cached data, and the modeled data.

Official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, caching was conventional to increase the performance of computer systems.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that caching is performed before modeling. The motivation would have been to facilitate debugging, programming, performance (as known in the art, systems using cached data can perform faster than systems without cached data), or to conform to the setup requirements of the database and models.

As to claim 68, Kramer of claim 67 does not expressly teach caching until the modeling (interpreted as caching until the modeling is complete) and then deleting (the data) upon the modeling.

However, official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to remove cached data when the data is no longer needed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the cached data is deleted after the modeling when the cached data is no longer needed by the models. The motivation would have been to use the cache efficiently by storing

necessary data and removing unnecessary data, as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 71, Kramer of claim 59 does not expressly disclose accepting a search request from the user, wherein the searching (for content) is in accordance with the search request.

However, Kramer discusses that it was conventional in “banner” advertising to accept a search request from a user (col. 1, l. 62 – col. 2, l. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that a search request can be received from the user in a “banner” advertising situation, and the consumer models (taught throughout Kramer) will be employed in combination with the search terms. The motivation would have been to provide “banner” advertising based on a user search request with a higher probability to be of interest to the user (based on col. 2, ll. 3-15), because Kramer builds an accurate consumer model, as taught throughout Kramer. Thus, the advertising power of Kramer is increased.

As to claim 80, Kramer of claim 59 teaches receiving feedback on the success of the content with the user (e.g., col. 32, l. 45 – col. 33, l. 14).

Kramer does not expressly disclose updating the modeling with the feedback. However, because Kramer teaches that the consumer models reflect the characteristics of the consumer (section starting at col. 10, l. 46), and that the consumer model is continuously refined (col. 11, ll. 38-54), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the

above teachings, such that the feedback updates the consumer database. The motivation would have been to further refine the consumer profile to gain an accurate consumer model, as taught throughout Kramer (e.g., col. 11, ll. 38-54), since useful information about the consumer's interest (e.g., consumer is interested in children's books, col. 32, ll. 66-67) is known.

As to claim 95, Kramer of claim 91 does not expressly disclose wherein the actual user characteristic comprises a search request from the user to be performed by the searching interface.

However, Kramer discloses an actual user characteristic, and a searching interface (see for example the illumination selection process of Kramer). Kramer discusses that it was conventional in "banner" advertising to accept a search request from a user (col. 1, l. 62 – col. 2, l. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the actual user characteristic comprises a search request and the searching interface uses the characteristic for providing a targeted advertisement. The motivation would have been to provide "banner" advertising based on a user search request with a higher probability to be of interest to the user (based on col. 2, ll. 3-15), because Kramer builds an accurate consumer model, as taught throughout Kramer. Thus, the advertising power of Kramer is increased.

As to claim 98, Kramer of claim 97 further teaches receiving user behavior (feedback such as clicking the rotator showing that the user is interested) responsive to

content provided to the user by the searching interface (illuminations selected for the user, e.g., col. 32, l. 45 – col. 33, l. 14).

Kramer does not expressly disclose updating the statistical probability output (for modeling) according to the behavior.

However, because Kramer teaches that the consumer models reflect the characteristics of the consumer (section starting at col. 10, l. 46), and that the consumer model is continuously refined (col. 11, ll. 38-54), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the behavior updates the probability output of the consumer model. The motivation would have been to further refine the consumer profile to gain an accurate consumer model, as taught throughout Kramer (e.g., col. 11, ll. 38-54), since useful information about the consumer's interest (e.g., consumer is interested in children's books, col. 32, ll. 66-67) is known.

As to claim 99, Kramer of claim 91 teaches monitoring user behavior on a communications device using a device monitor, as discussed throughout this action.

Kramer does not expressly teach a plurality of user communications devices (which are monitored).

However, it has been held that duplication of parts is obvious. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that there are a plurality of communications devices. The motivation as known to one of

ordinary skill in the art would have been to increase advertising power by sending targeted advertisements (illuminations of Kramer) to more than one of the user's computers.

As to claims 100 and 101, Kramer of claim 99 teaches monitoring user behavior for a television (col. 5, ll. 5-20, col. 9, ll. 45-65) and computer (e.g., fig. 1).

14. Claims 18-21 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al (U.S. Patent 6,327,574) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662).

As to claim 18, Kramer of claim 1 teaches wherein an actual user characteristic is generated in response to a user and stored in the database (e.g., filling out forms, col. 5, ll. 39-40), and a virtual database (e.g., fig. 8).

Kramer does not expressly teach the virtual database comprising an inquiry generator, and the user responding to an inquiry from the generator.

However, Dasan teaches a form inquiry (as seen in fig. 8-10). Dasan's inquiry has to be generated by an inquiry generator (e.g., web server, web page, etc) for presenting to the user. Kramer teaches that actual user characteristics are drawn from forms, as discussed above.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the virtual database can generate user inquiries such as the ones in Dasan. The motivation would have been to generate the database with detailed and generally accurate consumer information, as taught by Kramer (col. 5, ll. 30-45).

As to claim 19 and 20, the combination of Kramer and Dasan would further teach using the form data as part of the overall consumer model, because Dasan's form data would be used as part of the consumer model, as discussed above (see sections in Kramer about the consumer model).

Kramer and Dasan do not expressly teach permanently or temporarily storing the user response.

However, official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional to either temporarily or permanently store data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer and Dasan with the above teachings, such that user responses can either be permanently and temporarily stored. The motivation, as known to known of ordinary skill in the art for permanent storage would have been to allow future access to the data after the system has been turned off. The motivation for temporary storage would have been to save memory when the data is no longer needed.

As to claim 21, the combination of Kramer and Dasan would further teach wherein the inquiry generator comprises a monitor for monitoring at least one of said at least one communications device, and wherein the response by the user comprises an activity monitored by the monitor. For example, Dasan has to have a monitor monitoring when the user clicks on the form for submission (e.g., see fig. 7-10), so that data can be sent, stored, or generated.

As to claim 35 and claim 36, Kramer of claim 23 does not expressly teach an input mode selector controllable by the user

However, Dasan teaches an input mode selector controllable by the user (see fig. 7-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that an input mode selector controllable by the user is implemented for the virtual database. The motivation would have been to facilitate a user creating or editing his/her user profile for customizing the providing of content, as taught by Dasan (col. 6, ll. 54-60, col. 7, ll. 42-60, col. 4, ll. 42-50, col. 4, ll. 15-25).

As to claim 37, claim 38, and claim 39, the Kramer/Dasan combination further teaches wherein the input mode selector comprises a data input mode, a message request mode, and a search mode (see figs. 7-10 of Dasan).

As to claim 40, the combination of Kramer and Dasan does not expressly teach wherein the automated search mode is an automated search mode generated in accordance with the heuristic modeler.

However, the combination of Kramer and Dasan provides a search mode (see Dasan, fig. 8, #806) for a user profile. As discussed above, Kramer searches for the most appropriate advertisements (see illumination selection) based on a user profile (consumer model). As seen in Kramer, at least a part of the consumer model is heuristically generated (col. 21-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer and Dasan with the above teachings, such that an automatic search mode is provided, for providing targeted content according to the modeling of Kramer. The motivation would have been to facilitate providing interesting content to the user, as taught by Desan (col. 4, ll. 15-25), and throughout Kramer.

15. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al (U.S. Patent 6,327,574) in view of Agrawal et al ("On Integrating Catalogs").

As to claim 29, Kramer of claim 28 does not expressly teach weighing the actual characteristic 80% and the heuristic characteristic 20%.

However, Agrawal teaches assigning 80% of documents to a corresponding category and 20% to some other category (section 5, first paragraph), in other words, weighing a first category by 80% (80% of the documents are in this category), and weighing the other category by 20% (20% of the documents are in the other category). Agrawal describes this process as a simple 80-20 distribution.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that the weights of the actual and heuristic characteristics follow an 80-20 distribution, as discussed above. The motivation would have been to facilitate a higher accuracy for predictions (see figs 7-9). Note that the models using the 80-20 distribution generally achieve higher accuracy than the 90-10 and Gaussian distributions. As taught by

Agrawal, it would be a mistake if the percentage assigned to a different category were classified as an error (section 1, last 2 paragraphs).

16. Claims 3-4, 54-55, 58, 60, 82, and 102-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al (U.S. Patent 6,327,574) in view of Fingerhut (U.S. Patent 6,493,327).

As to claim 3, Kramer of claim 1 does not expressly teach wherein the communication device comprises a wireless device.

However, Fingerhut teaches a wireless communication device (Abstract, col. 3, II. 14-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings of Fingerhut, such that the communication device is wireless. The motivation would have been to increase the convenience and mobility of the user (the user is not tied down to a wired device), as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. An additional advantage of using wireless devices is that market research as to the location of the wireless device can be obtained, as taught by Fingerhut (col. 3, II. 23-26).

As to claim 4, Kramer and Fingerhut of claim 3 do not expressly teach wherein the wireless communications device is a cellular telephone.

However, Fingerhut teaches sending advertisements to wireless devices, and wireless phones (e.g., col. 11, II. 10-50, col. 1, II. 10-30).

Official notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was conventional for a wireless phone to be a cellular telephone.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer and Fingerhut with the above teachings, such that the wireless device is a cellular telephone. The motivation would have been to send targeted advertisements to cellular telephone users.

As to claim 54, Kramer of claim 53 does not expressly teach wherein the communications device is a wireless device.

However, Fingerhut teaches a wireless communication device (Abstract, col. 3, ll. 14-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings of Fingerhut, such that the communication device is wireless. The motivation would have been to increase the convenience and mobility of the user (the user is not tied down to a wired device), as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. An additional advantage of using wireless devices is that market research as to the location of the wireless device can be obtained, as taught by Fingerhut (col. 3, ll. 23-26).

As to claim 55, Fingerhut in the Kramer/Fingerhut combination of claim 54 would teach a wireless telephone (e.g., see Fingerhut, col. 11, ll. 10-48, col. 1, ll. 10-18).

As to independent claim 58, Kramer teaches the following claimed subject matter:

A first database comprising actual information (facts, col. 21, ll. 1-6) entered by a user of a communication device (user's forms, col. 5, ll. 39-40), and heuristically estimating and searching with respect to the first database (see mapping).

A second database comprising monitored information of behavior by the user of the wireless device (attribute vector, col. 20, ll. 65-66, fig. 8, see interpretation of user characteristic documents 806 and stored into database 804);

At least one heuristic database comprising heuristically estimated information on user behavior (see attribute vector, Boolean Abstractor, etc. in cols. 21-32 involving a measure of confidence, i.e. likelihood, that a user possesses a certain characteristic), wherein the heuristically estimated information is estimated in accordance with the second database;

A searcher that performs a search in accordance with the second database, and said at least one heuristic database, and that returns a result of the search to said wireless device (see "illumination selection process" starting at col. 23, l. 5, and the selection engine, col. 17, ll. 40-50, col. 21, ll. 50-60).

Kramer does not expressly disclose a wireless communication device.

However, Fingerhut teaches a wireless communication device (Abstract, col. 3, ll. 14-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings of Fingerhut, such that the communication device is wireless. The motivation would have been to increase the convenience and mobility of the user (the user is not tied down to a wired device), as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. An additional advantage of using wireless devices is that market research as to the location of the wireless device can be obtained, as taught by Fingerhut (col. 3, ll. 23-26).

As to claim 60, Kramer of claim 59 does not expressly teach wherein the communications device is a wireless device.

However, Fingerhut teaches a wireless communication device (Abstract, col. 3, II. 14-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings of Fingerhut, such that the communication device is wireless. The motivation would have been to increase the convenience and mobility of the user (the user is not tied down to a wired device), as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. An additional advantage of using wireless devices is that market research as to the location of the wireless device can be obtained, as taught by Fingerhut (col. 3, II. 23-26).

As to claim 82, Kramer of claim 81 does not expressly teach wherein the communications device is a wireless device.

However, Fingerhut teaches a wireless communication device (Abstract, col. 3, II. 14-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings of Fingerhut, such that the communication device is wireless. The motivation would have been to increase the convenience and mobility of the user (the user is not tied down to a wired device), as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. An additional advantage of using wireless devices is that market research as to the location of the wireless device can be obtained, as taught by Fingerhut (col. 3, II. 23-26).

As to claim 102, Kramer of claim 99 does not expressly teach a wireless telephone.

However, Fingerhut discloses a wireless telephone (col. 11, ll. 10-48, col. 1, 10-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that user behavior is monitored for a wireless telephone. The motivation would have been to target advertisements to a user of a wireless telephone, as taught by Fingerhut (col. 11, ll. 38-42).

As to independent claim 103, Kramer teaches the following claimed subject matter:

A first data bank of user characteristics, wherein said first data bank includes at least one user characteristic entered by the user, and at least one user characteristic monitored by a device monitor (e.g., maintained by the TIC system) monitoring the communications device (col. 12, ll. 17-27, col. 16, ll. 30-60, col. 5, ll. 30-60, attribute vector, col. 21-33);

A comparator communicatively connected to the first data bank (Boolean Abstractor, col. 21, ll. 23-31);

A second data bank of objective characteristic communicatively connected to the comparator (e.g., pregnancy confidence of 0.75, col. 21, ll. 25-30), wherein the objective characteristic is compared to the user characteristic by said comparator (e.g. determining an inequality for the user's pregnancy, col. 21, ll. 25-31) for a probabilistic

message target (a set of target illumination(s) selected based on the pregnancy likelihood);

An available content data bank including available content (set of illuminations, col. 21, ll. 32-60);

A content filter communicatively connected to said comparator and to said available content data bank, wherein the content filter accesses the available content, and filters the available content in accordance with the probabilistic message target output from said comparator (col. 21, ll. 50-60, choosing only the relevant illuminations);

Wherein the filtered available content is displayed to the user on the communications device (col. 21, ll. 58-61).

Kramer does not disclose a plurality of objective characteristics.

However, in Kramer, pregnancy is merely an exemplary characteristic (col. 21, ll. 25-30). Therefore, other characteristics can be defined.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that a plurality of objective characteristics are defined. The motivation would have been to improve the target advertising of Kramer, since advertisements are presented to the user in Kramer based on certain user characteristics.

Kramer does not expressly disclose a wireless communication device.

However, Fingerhut teaches a wireless communication device (Abstract, col. 3, ll. 14-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings of Fingerhut, such that the communication device is wireless. The motivation would have been to increase the convenience and mobility of the user (the user is not tied down to a wired device), as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. An additional advantage of using wireless devices is that market research as to the location of the wireless device can be obtained, as taught by Fingerhut (col. 3, ll. 23-26).

As to claims 104 and 105, Kramer of claim 103 further teaches wherein the available data bank (set of illuminations) comprises network and Internet content (fig. 6, col. 18, l. 30 – col. 19, l. 25, note that an illumination server sends illuminations as internet content).

17. Claims 26 and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer et al (U.S. Patent 6,327,574) in view of Filfield et al (U.S. Patent 6,869,018).

As to claim 26, Kramer of claim 24 does not expressly teach wherein the controller passes information to the storage database by data streaming.

However, Filfield teaches a controller passing information to a database by data streaming (col. 6, ll. 50-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that data is passed to the database by data streaming. The motivation would have been to store the data as it is received, as taught by Filfield (col. 6, ll. 50-55).

As to claim 94, Kramer of claim 92 does not expressly teach wherein the controller passes information to the storage database by data streaming.

However, Filfield teaches a controller passing information to a database by data streaming (col. 6, ll. 50-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kramer with the above teachings, such that data is passed to the database by data streaming. The motivation would have been to store the data as it is received, as taught by Filfield (col. 6, ll. 50-55).

Conclusion

18. Applicant's arguments were fully considered but were not persuasive.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-8594. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00; M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be contacted at (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CL
Assistant Examiner
AU 2161
12/22/2006

/CDL/
C. Dune Ly


TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100